GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY JULY 10, 2003

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing was convened in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room, 441 4th Street, N.W., Suite 220, Washington, D.C. 20001, pursuant to notice at 6:30 p.m., Carol Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

## ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice Chairperson PETER G. MAY Commissioner

(Architect of the Capitol)

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:

ALBERTO P. BASTIDA Secretary, Zoning Commission SHARON SCHELLIN Office of Zoning

OTHER AGENCY STAFF PRESENT:

ARTHUR JACKSON Office of Planning

**NEAL R. GROSS** COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701 www.nealrgross.com

## C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

	AGENDA ITEM	PAGE
PRELI	MINARY MATTERS	5
APPLI	CATION OF HIGH STREET COLUMBIA LLC: CASE NO. 03-11 ANC-2A	6
	NORMAN GLASGOW, JR., Esq 9 Holland & Knight LLP 2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 419-2460	
	JEFF SHERMAN	14
18 29	MARTIN WELLS	• • •
31	STEVEN SHER	• •
53	ALIZA SPERLING	• •
55	ARTHUR JACKSON	• •
55	DOROTHY MILLER	• •
63	BARBARA SPILLINGER	
70 72	NICOLE GLINEUR	

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

## P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (6:34 p.m.)

2.2

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a Public Hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, July 10, 2003. My name is Carol Mitten, and joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioner Peter May.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission case Number 03-11. This is a request by High Street Columbia LLC for the review and approval of a Consolidated Planned Unit Development and related zoning map amendment under Chapters 24 and 30 of the District of Columbia Zoning Regulations, 11 DCMR, for property known as Lot 806 in Square 25 with a street address of 2425 L Street, N.W.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on May 30, 2003, and a copy of that hearing announcement is available to you, and it is located in the wall bin near the door.

This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR, Section 3022, which are the Rules of Procedure for contested cases, and the order of procedure will be

as follows: Preliminary matters, followed by the presentation of the applicant's case, report by the Office of Planning, reports of any other government agencies, report of the affected Advisory Neighborhood Commission -- in this case, it is ANC-2A -- parties and persons in support, parties and persons in opposition, and then rebuttal by the applicant.

We will maintain the following time schedule in this hearing. The applicant will have 30 minutes. Parties will have 15 minutes. Organizations will have five minutes, and individuals will have three minutes.

The Commission intends to adhere to these time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations, if necessary, and notes that no time shall be ceded.

Parties may, at anytime, object to a question posed to a witness by another party or to evidence sought to be introduced into the record, if it is irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious. The Commissioners as well may request that such testimony or evidence not be received or

2.2

2 All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. 3 These cards are located on the table near the door 4 5 and on the table in front of us. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give 6 7 both cards to the reporter who is sitting to our right. 8 The decision of the Commission in this 9 10 must be based exclusively on the public 11 To avoid any appearance to the contrary, record. 12 the Commission requests that persons present not 13 the members of the Commission in engage conversation during a recess or at any other time. 14 15 Staff will be available throughout the hearing to discuss any procedural questions, and 16 17 you can direct any questions to Mr. Bastida or Mrs. 18 Schellin. 19 Please turn off all beepers and 20 cellphones at this time, so as not to disrupt these 21 proceedings. 2.2 this time, the Commission will Αt. 23 consider any preliminary matters. Mr. Bastida, do 24 you have any preliminary matters? 25 MR. BASTIDA: Yes, Madam Chairman.

that such evidence be struck from the record.

Applicant has complied with the 1 posting 2 requirements. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 3 4 also have a request for party status. Is Nicole 5 Glineur here? All right. You are representing the 1116 25th Street Condominium Association. 6 Is that 7 correct? Okay. So we have a request for party status from the Condominium Association 8 9 that is across the street from a portion of the 10 site, and that is Exhibit Number 25 in the record. Is there any objection to granting party status to 11 1116 25th Street Condominium Association? 12 All right then, without objection, the 13 1116 25th Street Condominium Association is granted 14 15 party status as a party in opposition. 16 other preliminary Are there any 17 All right. Then, Mr. Glasgow, I think --18 Well, actually, if you would come forward, and we 19 will ask Mrs. Schellin to administer the oath to 20 all those individuals who are planning 21 testifying this evening. Please rise now, 2.2 raise your right hand. 23 MS. SCHELLIN: Do you solemnly swear 24 that the testimony you will give in this evening's 25 hearing will be the truth, the whole truth, and

Т	nothing but the truth?
2	(WITNESSES SWORN.)
3	MR. GLASGOW: Madam Chair, we didn't
4	see that document until right now with respect to
5	this party in opposition. So we are trying to
6	ascertain whether we had any objection to that.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
8	MR. GLASGOW: At least the beginning of
9	it talked about a BZA case that we are not involved
10	in or doesn't involve the property. So I wanted to
11	understand whether they were making any type of
12	claim under the regulations which warranted
13	admission of party status.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: There is Under
15	letter F is where the justification for party
16	status begins, I think, in earnest, let's say.
17	MR. GLASGOW: All right.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So would you like
19	us to just wait a moment then?
20	MR. GLASGOW: If we can, if we can see
21	a copy of it. We are making a photocopy of it.
22	For whatever reason, we didn't see it in the
23	record.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Just for
25	the record, it was filed on June 26, 2003. So we

Τ	will just take a moment. Mrs. Miller?
2	MS. MILLER: I am Commissioner Miller,
3	Chair of ANC-2A. The person never came before our
4	ANC or registered any objections with the
5	Commission. I just wanted you to know.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
7	MR. GLASGOW: Is this a residential
8	unit or a commercial condominium unit?
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's not clear
10	to me, but does that matter in terms of the issues
11	that they have raised?
12	MR. GLASGOW: I guess we would just
13	note an objection for the record, because there is
14	a going through these items, distance between
15	the property and the subject property is about 25
16	feet. I mean, that is irrelevant. That's how
17	close somebody chose to build to a property line.
18	The environmental, social, economic
19	impacts, summary of testimony violation of the
20	historic zoning provisions Well, we have
21	approval from the Historic Preservation Review
22	Board. So that statement is in error.
23	2. Loss of light to all residents.
24	Loss of light and loss of view, loss of property
25	value Well, I quess we would have to wait and

see whether they can say anything about loss of 1 property value, but the loss of light and loss of 2 view -- They have no light in their easement over 3 this adjoining property. We are set back, and we 5 comply with all regulations. We haven't asked for anything with respect to any type of waiver from 6 7 the Commission for any setbacks. in traffic 8 Increase in already 9 congested block: I don't believe that DDOT has 10 submitted anything in opposition to this 11 application. 12 Street parking: There is nothing in the record to indicate how we would affect street 13 parking one way or the other, and loss in quality 14 15 of life is just a very amorphous statement. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand. 16 Ι 17 don't think that the purpose necessarily at this 18 juncture is to refute their concerns, but just to 19 acknowledge that they have them and whether or not 20 they are a valid basis for grant party status. 21 All after riaht. So noting 2.2 Glasgow's objection, is there any change in the position of any of the Commissioners? All right. 23 24 Thank you, Mr. Glasgow.

MR. GLASGOW: All right.

25

Thank you.

Good evening, Madam Chairman, members of the Commission. For the record, my name is Norman M. Glasgow, Jr., law firm of Holland and Knight, representing the Applicant for rezoning to C-2-C in a Planned Unit Development approval for a historic landmark, Columbia Hospital for Women site, and that's development, and its conversion to residential use with ground floor retail.

Here with me this evening are Mr. Jeff Sherman on behalf of High Street Columbia LLC, the owners of the site; and Trammell Crow, the project developer; Shalom Baranes and Patrick Burkhart of the architectural firm of Shalom Baranes Associates, architects of the project; Mr. Marty Wells, traffic engineer; and Mr. Steven Sher, land planner. Also here with me this evening is Miss Carolyn Brown of the law firm of Holland & Knight.

Misters Baranes, Wells, and Sher are also admitted as expert witnesses in the fields of architecture, traffic engineering, and land planning respectively, and they have all been previously accepted in these capacities as experts by the Board.

Before proceeding to the testimony of the witnesses, I would like to offer a brief

2.2

opening statement.

2.2

Even before putting the property under contract last September, the Applicant in this case has diligently worked with and met with community representatives, including those of the Foggy Bottom Association and ANC-2A, to work out a redevelopment program for the property that met the needs of the community and addressed historic preservation concerns involving the rehabilitation and restoration of the historic Columbia Hospital for Women site.

The Applicant also worked extensively with the Office of Planning staff, including zoning and historic preservation staff, to bring you a project which fits within the parameters of the existing R-5-D zone and, given the opposition, we think that that is important to note.

If it were not for the requested 28,000 square feet of retail on the ground floor, floor area of retail, which we worked out -- up to 28,000 square feet, which we worked out with the community at their request, we wouldn't even be here this evening. We meet all the requirements of the R-5-D district except for that, and that is the only reason why there is a rezoning application.

This retail use necessitates a rezoning to C-2-C, which is consistent with surrounding commercial zoning, including that of the northern 3 half of the square and property located to the west 5 and south. We have community representatives from the ANC and the Foggy Bottom Association, and I 7 understand that they in support of this are application. furtherance of the understandings which we have worked out with the community, the 11 Applicant has recorded a covenant amendment, a copy 12 of which is attached as Exhibit I of the prehearing That now has been recorded in the land 13 statement. records of the District of Columbia. 14 I would also like to confirm for the 16 record that the Commission has received copies of 17 the Applicant's prehearing submission. 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, we have. MR. GLASGOW: Okay, thank you. 20 The Applicant is also pleased to have 21 the support of the Office of Planning, and is in 2.2

general agreement with the conditions set forth in the Office of Planning report, and I will get to that in just a minute. We want to have flexibility to have up to 235 residential units, as long as we

1

2

6

8

9

10

15

19

23

24

have one parking space that would be -- as long as we provide one residential parking space per residential unit.

We also would like to provide up to 28,000 square feet of floor area for the retail. That is not gross floor area. It's floor area. Some of it is -- The site has some slopes, and some of it is in FAR, and some is out of FAR.

We also want to provide up to 320 parking spaces, and the parking spaces -- The way that we would like those to be is we would provide one per -- For the number of residential units that we have, there would be a parking space available for residential.

Assuming that that is 235, then there would be 235 spaces that would be available for residential, 61 parking spaces available -- or 31 -- 31 parking spaces available for the retail at the 28,000 square foot level, and the rest of the parking, if we do provide up to 320 spaces, we would let the market dictate whether those would be best utilized for additional residential parking spaces or are needed as commercial parking spaces.

2.2

Lastly, because this is a historic

landmark property and subject to the review of the Historic Preservation Review Board, we would like the order of the Commission to grant flexibility for revisions that may result from further work with the Historic Preservation Review Board staff, the Review Board and, if necessary, the Mayor's agent, so long as those modifications are consistent with the parameters of the R-5-D zone except for the up to 28,000 square feet of retail and the 31 parking spaces that are attendant to that retail.

asking this degree We are of flexibility, because this is a unique situation which brings us to the Commission. basically, as we understand it, was to address a the Office of concern of the Commission and Planning that in a rezoning to C-2-C that protection of the PUD covenant would be desired by the city, because under C-2-C zoning you could go up to six FAR, and we are only asking to go up to a maximum of 3.5 FAR, which is the R-5-D, and our most recently approved plans with the Historic Preservation Review Board are at about 3.31 FAR.

So because of all of that, we want to have that degree of flexibility, because we are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

still continuing to work out our facade and the 1 precise placement of the building with the Historic 2 Preservation Review Board. 3 4 If there are no preliminary questions, 5 I would like to proceed with the testimony of the witnesses. 6 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Please just ahead and continue. 8 9 MR. GLASGOW: Thank you. Mr. Sherman, 10 would you please identify yourself for the record 11 and proceed with your testimony? 12 Thank you. Jeff Sherman. MR. SHERMAN: 13 I am Managing Director of Trammell Crow Company, and we are the owner of High Street Columbia, owner 14 15 of the property. 16 I don't want to repeat what Chip just 17 told you. So I'll be careful here to make sure 18 that I stay focused on points that I would like to 19 make. But we have been working with the community 20 We did make -- After careful since September. 21 negotiation, we made arrangements with the Foggy 2.2 Bottom Association and ANC to get relief from a 23 covenant they held on the site in December, which 24 enabled us to contemplate going to the full 350,000

feet that is available under the R-5-D zone.

Then we started appearing right in this very room before the HPRB in December, and it took me countless meetings and four trips to the Board before we got to a design that they supported, which was an interactive process on both sides and, I think, a good one, because at the end of the day I think we are all pleased with where we ended up. You will get to see that, because Shalom is going to show it to you. But that took us until April.

Then really now, what I am trying to do is satisfy another obligation I made to the Foggy Bottom Association and the ANC, which is to try to get them community-serving retail which will enable this project to be sort of a town center for the west end. We want to fill in sort of an empty hole in that area of the neighborhood and create a street presence and some life to it, as well as to provide the amenities that would really help the whole entire area with the kind of retail that Not looking to put isn't there right now. boutiques or anything like that. I am negotiating with grocery stores and hardware stores and people like that. That's who we are talking to, and that's what we are trying to go after.

As Chip said, we don't need anything

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

more than that. We just want to be able to get the retail in, and Office of Planning felt this was the best way to go, and we are happy to be able to support them on that, and that is why we are here.

I am in negotiations with several of these retailers. I hate to contradict my own lawyer, but I will tell you that the negotiation with grocery stores is typical of the industry. You know, we offer something, and they come back and they ask for a lot more. But with regard to the parking, you know, we have 31 spaces that we have designed in the building to be suitable for their use, and they have come back and asked for 60.

I don't physically -- I won't be able to give them 60 spaces, but at the same time I may need a little flexibility there, and hoping that we can settle on some number that might be above 30 but below 60. I would like you to stay within the discussion that we started out previously, which says that, as long as we've got one space per unit, we can be a little bit more flexible with how we use the rest of the spaces in the site, which you alluded to.

I just want to make sure that you know

2.2

that we are banging our heads with these people, and we are going to make a deal, but it's not easy, especially this neighborhood, because it hasn't had much in the way of precedence for success on a retail basis. But we will get there.

We do think the design will be a nice enhancement to the area, and we've been working pretty carefully to preserve the historic features of the central building, which will be retained in the design, and you will see that when Shalom gets to present.

Right now, the plans have us building a total of 225 housing units inside this envelope, to be sold at prices that will range from approximately \$380,000 on the smaller side to more than \$2 million on the high side.

The majority of the units will sell in the range of about \$700,000 to \$900,000, and I believe they should be bringing residents to the area that will be both help with regard to their capacity to stabilize it as a residential neighborhood, as well as to improve the area and pay their fair share of taxes.

We think this is the right logical transition of this failed hospital, which failed

2.2

through an insolvency process back in March of last
year. We think it logically should be transitioned
into residential development, and I think what the
community is supporting and what we are trying to
do is to get owner occupied housing in the
neighborhood. We want to bring residents, not more
renters. There's plenty of rental capacity that
will be built right to the north of us in two
buildings that JBG is putting up on the north end
of the block.
So we think that, by offering a quality
housing development with owner occupants that is
enhanced by retail on the first floor, we will be
able to get to the kind of environment that this
neighborhood really has the potential to be. So
that's why we are here.
With that, I will turn it over to
Shalom.
MR. BARANES: Thank you. Shalom
Baranes with Shalom Baranes & Associates. Could I
stand next to the boards? Will the mike pick it
up?
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure. I have
this, too.
MD DADANES. I want to grant by just

б

showing you some images of the existing conditions. You know, what is most interesting about the building as it exists today is that, actually, you look at it, and it looks like a hospital. The reason it looks like a hospital is because it's had so many additions over the years. So it's just totally incongruous with what the original structure was, and it's quite chaotic from an architectural standpoint.

The original building that you see here in blue, which is this large mass here with two towers, and a belvedere that used to be here has been removed, and then the two Y-sections here and here shown in blue -- that is the original 1915 structure, and everything else that you see here in these other colors was added on over time.

Our intent is to strip all of this away, remove everything that was not part of the 1915 structure, reestablish the presence of this building in relationship to its site so that it will sit symmetrically on the site -- today it does not -- to restore it by reconstructing some of the elements that have been removed, as well as reconstructing and repairing some of these walls here that have been buried or removed in the

2.2

building, and then, of course, undertaking a fairly complete approach to cleaning up the facade and doing whatever has to be done to repair it, and again reestablish orientation to the site, and then to build two wings which are symmetrical, one on this side and one on this side, so that we will essentially go from this kind of a site plan to this kind of a site plan.

What was a little surprising to us is by the time we got done designing our scheme here - and we did not start out with this goal -- we found that we were at a 57 percent lot occupancy, which is exactly what the existing condition is, 57 percent lot occupancy. So we will not be increasing that.

One small added bonus is that we will be increasing the green space from 16 percent of the site to 32 percent of the site by reducing the paved area. So I think that will be a major improvement to what you see there today.

These are a couple of historic images of what the building used to look like. I mainly want to show you this to point out this element here that is missing that we will reconstruct, as well as these porches here which have been -- some

2.2

of them have been bricked in with masonry walls.

All of these screens and this very fine tracery has been removed and replaced by very heavy aluminum windows, which we will replace, and basically try to restore this appearance that you see here, even though the space will be enclosed.

In addition to that, as I said, we are going to try to restore the relationship of the building to its site, and part of it, of course, will be the development of the landscape. Since Mr. Parsons is not here, I probably don't have to go into any detail on that. Right? Okay. But I would be glad to do that, if you would like me to come back to it.

This is a model view. It's an early model, actually. We have modified the massing very slightly as we have gone through the Review Board process, but it is very, very close to what you see here.

Again, the general intent has been to try to make sure that our massing was pushed back from the front so that, from both this intersection and this intersection up and down Pennsylvania Avenue, when you look at the project, you will be able to see the original building, uninterrupted by

2.2

the new construction. That's why it steps the way it does.

Also, we carved our addition over a period of three or four hearings, as Jeff just said, with the Review Board. We carved building here and here, away from the existing building, so that the way you perceive skyline building against the is really interrupted, not changed in any significant way by the new construction.

It was very important to the Review Board and to us also, certainly, to get a reading here of really three separate masses and to have the center one especially be very distinct. We will be able to achieve that.

This was a very early massing sketch. We have developed the design quite a bit since then, but I am showing you this mainly to indicate our notion about the massing, which again you see the space carved out here.

You see how these pavilions are low. You see how we have these setbacks so that you could imagine from Pennsylvania Avenue to the west as well as to the east, you would be able to look across this pavilion, over the top of it, and still

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

understand this very rich Mediterranean-like top of the building against the sky. So that, really, I think, will be enhanced by all of the work that we are proposing to do here.

This is another view that, I think, more than the other one, allows you to understand what the scale of the proposed addition is to the existing building. This is taken from a pedestrian viewpoint, looking to the east, and everything that you see here in the foreground is existing construction or reconstructed elements, and this, of course, is the new part here.

The idea of the massing for this portion of the project really came from looking at this and looking at the way these wide pavilions relate to the large mass. Essentially, you have a large rectangular block here with two small pavilions in front of it, and we took that theme, that concept, and repeated it here to some degree, with the large rectangular element here and then the smaller pavilion in the front.

In terms of the facade treatment, the materials, we are -- These are very current drawings. They are not even finished. We are working to develop these further to take them to

2.2

the Review Board within the next two weeks. But we are looking at a brick skin.

I have a couple of photographs here of the Turkish Chancery that we completed several years ago on Mass. Avenue. The reason I'm showing you this is because it has some of the elements in terms of the exterior facade materials that we hope to use on the apartment building.

Our budget here, as you can imagine, is not what it was here. However, we think -- or maybe it will be, who knows? But we think we can achieve many of the -- much of the character that you see here in this building in this apartment building. Of course, this also has somewhat of a Mediterranean style or Mediterranean character to it.

The notion is that we will use a light color brick which will be different than the existing brick on the central pavilion. It will have a somewhat different shade. It will be accented with pre-cast elements, and we are dividing the building up into -- you can see an upper attic story portion and then a main body here that relates in terms of its horizontal cornice to the height -- to some of the major cornice lines on

2.2

the existing building. But the lower portion will all be rendered in brick, in pre-cast, a little bit of stone at the bottom.

Then we are using metal, glass and aluminum in a similar way that we used it on the Turkish Chancery here to connect the two pavilions that you see here. They are connected with this metal hyphen which is really meant to recall a greenhouse type structure, and it is supposed to relate -- meant to relate to the landscape a little bit more, be a little bit lighter, a little more transparent.

That is the kind of vocabulary we will be using at the top of the building here for the two penthouse floors, as well as for some of the bays that will line all -- both street sides, 24th and 25th, as well as the two inside faces of the courtyard.

Here I am finally part of the case with the retail. But let me start on the right here. Although the building will have a single main entrance which will occur through the historic building, which is raised a full floor above L Street, there is about a 15 foot drop across the site. It will have a circular drive, the main

2.2

entrance through here, the main lobby here, and then access to three separate residential cores, one, two, three.

So at this floor everything is connected, and we are here one level above the retail which faces 24th Street and 25th Street. So the retail is below this main lobby level.

When you get up into the building, you recall that the buildings separate here and here. So once you get above the second floor, this corridor no longer connects through. It becomes three separate corridors, each one of them serviced by its own residential elevator core, each one serviced by two separate fire stairs. So really, in effect, above the second floor it becomes three separate buildings.

Now when you go to the level below this, this is what everything looks like. We have put a lot of the service down here as well as the retail. On 24th Street we are able to get approximately 13,000 square feet of retail, which has frontage along here. So the entire front of the facade here on the retail is exposed to the street. This will not read like an English basement. The floor of the retail will be within a

2.2

foot or so of the grade at 24th Street. There is a slight slope there.

On 25th Street -- Actually, before I finish on this side, as the grade rises here, there is a berm. As the grade goes up from here up to here, we take that grade, that rise in grade, and

It's at this point here that the glass to the retail gets exposed all along here. So,

again, it will be full retain frontage.

about here somewhere.

we wrap it around here as a berm which ends right

On the 25th Street side, because the grades are a little different, and because we do have an historic wall that wraps around the site that we've been asked to keep by the Preservation Review Board, we have taken the berm and we've wrapped it much further around. We have wrapped it all the way back to here, so that the retail only gets an exposure along here.

That, apparently, is fine with the supermarket. This is the side that we would put the supermarket on, and we expect that this is the side that would have multiple tenants.

In addition to that, we also wound up placing the primary service access for the

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

supermarket, for the retail, which requires quite a bit of servicing in the loading area here, off of this curb cut at 25th Street. So the trucks would be able to pull in here, be in a dedicated service area which also has the trash for the whole building, and be able to pull out that way without interfering with the other traffic in the building.

Adjacent to that we have a ramp which takes you down to retail parking right below here.

That occurs on a level below this. That is also shared as an alternative means of egress by some of the residents.

The primary access to the garage for the residents is actually on the other side. It's right through here. This is dedicated to the residential parking. It comes here. It turns and then wraps down, and the parking covers pretty much most of the footprint of the site that is not occupied by the historic building.

So actually, I just had to say, it was quite difficult fitting everything in. I mean putting multiple retail tenants and a supermarket under a residential building with an historic building in the middle is very expensive, very difficult to do, very expensive.

2.2

Everything is extraordinarily tight, 1 but we think everything is working. We really only 2 probably, if anything, have inches to spare on this 3 4 floor, as we look around it. 5 Okay. So that's pretty much all I wanted to tell you. If you have any questions 6 7 about this, I guess we should take them later, right after our 30 minutes are up. Thank you. 8 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 10 MR. GLASGOW: Next I would like to call 11 the traffic engineer, Mr. Wells. Could you please 12 identify yourself for the record and proceed with 13 your testimony. Good evening. 14 MR. WELLS: Yes. Мy 15 Marty Wells, President of Wells is name 16 Associates, and we were retained by High Street 17 Columbia to conduct a traffic study. 18 Based on DDOT's request, we evaluated, 19 of course, the two driveways on 24th and 25th 20 looked at off-site Streets. We also four 21 intersections, the intersection of 25th and L and 2.2 Penn, the intersections of 25th and M, 24th and M, and 24th and L. 23 24 We evaluated the morning and afternoon 25 peak hours, both today and in the future, with and

without redevelopment of this property.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

These will be findings: Our no surprise to you. The intersection of 25th, L and Penn, in fact, operates at or near capacity. intersections of 24th, 25th and M Streets have adequate capacity to carry the peak hour traffic that uses those intersections today. They, fact, operate at level of service A or B in the morning. What we find in the afternoon, although the intersections do have adequate capacity, that some of the back-ups from Pennsylvania Avenue, K Street, the arterials leading to the bridges cause congestion at those intersections.

Our traffic study was based on 200 residential units and 28,000 square feet of retail space. We have since evaluated the larger number of units, 235 units. We find that that program would generate about 110 morning peak hour trips, 207 afternoon peak hour trips. About a third of those trips in the morning would be retail trips. About two-thirds of those trips in the afternoon would be retail trips.

Of the retail trips, about half of them would be trips that are already on the street. These would be trips that, for example, somebody

going form work to home in the afternoon might stop in one of the retail centers to pick up the proverbial loaf of bread and quarter of milk.

mind that this site Bear in generate significant traffic volumes when it was a hospital. An 82-bed hospital -- We estimate because we weren't able to measure the driveway counts, because the hospital is no longer there, but an 82-bed hospital, we would estimate, would generate about 88 morning peak hour trips, about 100 afternoon trips.

The residential uses alone would generate fewer trips than that hospital generated.

Now the residential and the retail together would generate a few more peak hour trips, new peak hour trips than the hospital generated.

In the interest of time, our conclusions are that the number of trips that would be generated by this proposed development will not change the existing or projected future levels of service at the intersections we looked at. The project, therefore, would have no significant adverse traffic impact.

We also find that the amount of parking that will be provided here or proposed to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

provided here will be adequate. As Mr. Sherman has 1 said, the proposal is to provide at least one 2 parking space per unit. The average auto ownership 3 in this census tract for owner occupied dwellings 4 5 is about .7 automobiles per unit. This proposal will result in no loss of 6 7 on-street parking. Thank you. Thank you, 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. 9 Wells. 10 MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Sher, would you 11 please identify yourself for the record, 12 proceed with your testimony. Madam Chair, members of the 13 MR. SHER: Commission, for the record my name is Steven E. 14 15 Sher, the Director of Zoning and Land Use Services with the law firm of Holland & Knight. 16 I have 17 three minutes, and I'm going to make it quick. 18 You have a report before you, but I am 19 going to sort of just get to what I think is the 20 heart of this. If you turn to the existing zoning 21 map, which is three pages from the back, and you 2.2 look at the Columbia Hospital site, which is the one marked R-5-D in the middle of the sort of left 23 24 center of the page, you can see that to the north,

to the south, to the west are already existing C-2-

C zoning. The area to the east is R-5-B, but about half of that is devoted to the west end library.

So what surrounds this site already is commercial uses or existing nonresidential uses and commercial heightened density greater than what is proposed in this application.

Again, the current site is R-5-D, which permits a 90 foot height and a 3.5 FAR. We would not exceed those parameters in the total. The basis for this application is to put in up to 28,000 square feet of retail.

Looking at the comprehensive analysis, which begins 10 on page and runs thereafter, the generalized land use map shows this institutional, reflecting its previous site as hospital use. But if you look at the character of what is designated around it, assuming that it is not institutional anymore, it is mixed use, high density residential, medium density commercial to the north and east, and mixed use, high density residential, low density commercial to the south and west.

So we've got mixed use, mixed use, high density residential with some commercial. The amount of commercial that we have put in here is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

clearly in the range of low density.

2.2

If you look at the land use -- excuse me, at the housing and Ward 2 elements of the comprehensive plan, there are consistent statements about trying to get more residential in the city in appropriate locations, particularly adjacent to proposed employment centers and office areas.

There is a specific provision which says "complete residential, non-hotel development in the west end." That's in the Ward 2 plan.

My conclusion is that the project is not inconsistent with the comprehensive plan, that it is within the applicable height and bulk standards of the regulations, and consistent with the zoning immediately to the north, south, and west, that it enhances the residential component of the mix in the west end, that the PUD allows the Zoning Commission to lock in what it is we have committed to do, even though there is already a covenant which locks in what we have committed to do, and it is my opinion that you should approve said project. Thirty seconds to spare.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Sher.

MR. GLASGOW: This completes the

Τ	Applicant's direct presentation.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
3	Glasgow. Any questions from the Commission? Mr.
4	May?
5	COMMISSIONER MAY: I have just a few
6	questions. The first question is a traffic
7	question, actually.
8	I am curious about the plan for
9	accessing the parking from 24th Street and 25th
LO	Street. My recollection is that they are both
L1	pretty narrow streets. I don't remember the
L2	dimensions. They are probably in here somewhere.
L3	I'm wondering about whether there are issues with
L 4	the traffic flow in and out of those garages,
L 5	whether it's going to be a problem.
L6	I just have this vague recollection of
L 7	having trouble going down 25th Street with traffic
L8	back when it was a hospital. I'm wondering is this
L 9	the right place? Was there consideration of other
20	ways to access the parking?
21	MR. WELLS: Let me Shalom may have
22	some comments on this as well, but let me take a
23	crack at it.
24	COMMISSIONER MAY: I went through the
25	architectural side at the very last second there, I

know.

б

COMMISSIONER MAY:

Okay.

the street.

I guess the

architectural side of that question: Did you look at other ways of bringing the parking in, because it's -- I mean, you have access to the site from every side. I know there are, obviously, reasons why you wouldn't want to go in through the front, although it would make sense from a -- in a three-dimensional way to be able to come in kind of at a low point there and have -- You know, it would be a natural sort of driveway entrance from the front side, but I can see why you wouldn't want to do that for aesthetic reasons, and I know that the alley in the back sort of goes up from there.

I'm just wondering whether these were really the only spots that were left as a result of that or did you look at other ways to get parking - access to the parking?

MR. BARANES: We did look at many, many different ways. Actually, at one point we even had a scheme coming in from the front, but it was very difficult to make that work, partially for some of the reasons you stated, partially because once we got down into the garage, it was very hard to get the ramps to work with the historic building there.

Once we abandoned that approach, we did look at different ways of dividing the access up

2.2

between 24th Street and 25th Street, and we did feel that this approach we have here is the best, because it does pretty substantially separate the residential traffic from the commercial traffic.

The primary access, as I said, for the residential is on the east side, not on the west side. We think that we are designing this so that the residential use of the west side of 25th Street there will be primarily egress oriented. The ingress will be mostly off of the other side.

The access off the private alley would have been very difficult, because it does slope up very quickly, and it's quite steep, and also it's difficult to get into the building once you are in that alley, because it is so high.

So anyway, for all those various reasons, we wound up where we are here.

COMMISSIONER MAY: Another question I had was just about the alley itself and its --- I mean the way it -- It's still just there, and the building is just backing up to it. Is some of it part of the property, and some of it is not? I don't really quite understand that. Was there other thought about how that could be incorporated into the site, either for circulation of residents'

2.2

1	vehicles or what have you?
2	MR. BARANES: Our adjacency to the
3	alley is really better shown in this drawing than
4	that drawing. Almost everything you see here is
5	below grade, below the alley.
6	So what we, in fact, have here is a
7	series of apartment units with windows directly or
8	the alley. Our property line This is a private
9	alley. It's really shared by both the owners to
LO	the north and ourselves. So we don't have full use
L1	of that.
L2	We do intend to give some of these
L 3	units at grade here some private outdoor space,
L 4	where we can, and that still has to be negotiated
L 5	with the property owners to the north.
L 6	COMMISSIONER MAY: So you may be able
L 7	to break out a little bit and capture some of that?
L 8	MR. BARANES: Hopefully. They are
L9	using it for access also. So it's going to be
20	quite limited.
21	COMMISSIONER MAY: It's a pretty broad
22	alley. It's as broad as the street, isn't it?
23	MR. BARANES: It's about 30 feet. Is
24	that what we have? Twenty. We have 20 feet total.
25	COMMISSIONER MAY: Oh, okay.

MR. SHERMAN: It's not that wide. We need to keep it open for fire access.

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. I'm not

COMMISSIONER MAY: All right. I'm not sure you can answer this question, Mr. Sherman, but where did you find a supermarket that would take 12,500 square feet and no on-grade parking?

MR. SHERMAN: There aren't a lot of them.

COMMISSIONER MAY: I know.

MR. SHERMAN: And the ones that are, are very cocky, the ones that will. They are very difficult to deal with, but we have one from Philadelphia who is trying to enter the market who is interested, and then we have -- I hate to commit to this, but the one we are most further along with is Trader Joe's. They are growing rapidly, and they are the ones that we are having the largest amount of discussions with, but they are also the ones that are the most difficult right now, because they are in the position of they feel that strength. So they are asking for the world, and we are trying to offer something slightly less than that.

I think we will make some kind of an arrangement with them, but --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	COMMISSIONER MAY: Right. Well, I
2	appreciate your sharing that information with us.
3	I assume that others are aware of this and would be
4	enthusiastic about it. I mean just the idea of
5	being able to get that kind of supermarket into the
6	building.
7	MR. SHERMAN Once you lose the handful
8	of people that build at this size, it becomes
9	difficult, because everybody else wants to do a
10	50,000 foot box in the suburbs with, you know, lots
11	of cars and street parking.
12	COMMISSIONER MAY: Street parking and
13	service parking. We know that well. Okay, thanks.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you,
16	Madam Chair. Mr. Glasgow, in your opening
17	statement you mentioned that this case is only
18	before us basically because of the retail
19	component. Am I correct?
20	MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.
21	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And in the I
22	think it's the 25th Street Association, Mr.
23	Baranes, can you show me where they are located;
24	because Mr. Glasgow mentioned that there was a
25	setback, and I don't believe the setback is on 25th

1	Street.
2	Actually, if you put up the model view,
3	I think that would be better for us to look at it,
4	to help give me an understanding. The 25th Street
5	Association do you know the location where they
6	are located?
7	MR. BARANES: No, I don't.
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Oh, you don't?
9	
LO	MR. GLASGOW: We wanted to find that
11	out, because when it said that their property
L2	the distance is about 25 feet. The best that we
L3	can tell, it's up the block from us on the other
L 4	side of the street. So it's at least 90 feet away.
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Maybe
16	I'll reserve that until they come to the table. I
L 7	wanted to find out the relationship, because when I
L 8	look at the setback and I figure 25th Street Condo
L9	Association would be on 25th Street, I may be
20	incorrect. But I think the setback is on the front
21	side, at least the way I'm looking at it. Anyway,
22	that's a question I'll hold.
23	You answered a question about the
	1

concerns me is how we are working out the shared

the supermarket.

24

25

footage to

But

_	parking, the parking on the 25th Street Side for
2	the supermarket as opposed to the parking for the
3	condos.
4	You mentioned, Mr. Baranes, that it
5	would be shared parking. I guess the condo
6	association will work that out along with the
7	retail. I really would think that they would need
8	some guidance, because I just don't see how that
9	would work. Maybe you can expound upon it or let
LO	me know.
11	MR. BARANES: Sure. This is the
L 2	parking level just below the retail, and the way it
L 3	works is that the retail has access through here.
L 4	It's a ramp that comes down, comes down to here,
15	and then this whole area here is reserved for the
L6	retail.
L 7	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Retail only?
18	MR. BARANES: Retail only on this
L 9	level.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Nov
21	where is the area that's going to be shared also
22	where the condos will be able to also utilize that
23	side? At least, I thought that is what you
24	mentioned.
25	MR. BARANES: They can share access.

For example, there's a gate across here. All of this and everything below here is residential parking, and the primary access to this residential parking is through this ramp right here.

Now if someone -- If a resident is parked here, that resident could drive across here, go through this electronic gate, and then take this ramp up and go either north or south on 25th Street.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. If I'm a resident and I decide to park in the residential area, I guess -- Has there been any thought how we are going to work that out? I guess, if I decide to park in the residential -- I mean in the commercial area where the supermarket is, and actually I should be parking where the residents are supposed to be parking -- I see that just causing a problem. Maybe that will be worked out later, but it's something for thought, I believe.

MR. BARANES: It will be worked out very carefully, because the residents will all be assigned spaces. Do you want to talk about that?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes. We intend to provide one parking space per unit as part of the sales process. So they will buying a space, and it

2.2

will be assigned if you are a resident. So you 1 will have an assigned residential space within the 2 building. 3 4 If you try to park in the space that's 5 reserved for retail and you are not out of there within an hour, you are going to get a mighty big 6 7 charge to get out, and we are going to keep a close 8 eye on you, and we are going to ticket. 9 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's what I 10 was wanting to hear. 11 We are going to ticket MR. SHERMAN: 12 you and pull you out of there with a tow truck, if 13 you are not paying attention. 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD; That's actually 15 what I wanted to hear, how it was going to be dealt with. 16 The other question is the Office of 17 18 Planning, and I see where you have, obviously, 19 agreed to it in your submittal, dealing with the 20 DOES agreement. One thing that I always like to 21 see, and I would encourage the Applicant, if you 2.2 could, if you know of things in advance of jobs 23 that may be coming down the pike, if you can kind 24 of let the pool over at DOES know in advance what

those jobs are, so when it comes time to go into

2	is qualified." So maybe they can get their pool
3	together and get them up to speed.
4	Mr. Glasgow, also in the Office of
5	Planning report, and when we set this down, there
6	was an alternative. I'm hearing more tonight of
7	the C-2-C. Has the other alternative, the
8	establishment of which may take some time, of
9	high density residential/retail overlay over the
LO	current underlying 5-B district is that still up
11	for discussion?
L2	MR. GLASGOW: Due to the timing as to
L3	where we are right now and that's why we wanted
L <b>4</b>	to move forward with the C-2-C originally, because
15	there had been some discussions early on with the
L 6	Office of Planning that this high density
L 7	residential overlay was being discussed, and we
L 8	were very concerned that it would not be able to
L9	keep pace with the timing that we needed to have.
20	I think everybody recognized that, and
21	that's been borne out now. So we are not
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So that's off
23	the table?
24	MR. GLASGOW: We are not looking at
25	that at this point in time.

that pool, we won't hear the normal quote, "nobody

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: 1 Okav. I was just wondering if you wanted to wait around. 2 Who knows when that is going to happen. 3 MR. GLASGOW: No, sir. 4 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's all I But I would like to say, while I don't know 6 7 whether this is going to be voted up or down, I 8 would like to applaud the Applicant for 9 efforts. I've been here for a couple of years, and 10 I now see ANC-2A. I was wondering if I was going 11 to ever see them come down in agreeance with 12 something. 13 While I'm not making that very lightly, what I'm saying is I think that it's well deserving 14 15 of the ANC to protect their neighborhood, and I 16 But this shows that this Applicant applaud them. 17 has really reached out to the community, and I want 18 to commend them for that. Thank you, Madam Chair. 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. 20 I, too, think that the project is great, and 21 I think it's very exciting, and this is consistent 2.2 with what we are trying to -- that we hope to 23 eventually accomplish with high the density 24 residential/retail overlay.

Along those lines, I just really have

1	one question, which is: I believe, Mr. Glasgow,
2	that you made a distinction in your opening
3	statement, that the Applicant would like the
4	flexibility to provide up to 28,000 square feet of
5	retail, as opposed to what the Office of Planning
6	was recommending, which was at least 28,000 square
7	feet of retail.
8	What we are hoping to accomplish
9	eventually through that HDRR overlay is that the
10	space set aside for neighborhood serving retail.
11	So is there a commitment to a minimum amount?
12	MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Sherman, you want to
13	address the potential for a minimum amount, in
14	response to the question of the Chair?
15	MR. SHERMAN: I don't honestly know
16	what number to tell you. I mean, we are in the
17	As we just discussed about grocery stores, there's
18	a certain number of them that will do business in
19	this size range and, if we, for some reason, fail
20	to get them in there, then I don't know what I
21	would do next in terms of solving the grocery store
22	problem.
23	I will have a minimum commitment to
24	community serving retail on the other side.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

1 MR. SHERMAN: Because I know I will be able to get a hardware store. They average about 2 3500 feet. Then the pharmacies come in around 3 3,000 feet and that kind of thing. So I'll be able 5 to make that side work, but the reason we have asked for flexibility up to 28,000 is that at this 6 7 point where we are in the negotiations, I just don't know how we are going to settle out. 8 9 So if we want to pick some number that 10 says -- I'm making this up as I sit here answering your question. But if you said 10,000, I could 11 12 respond to that. It's just that --13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How much retail space is on the 24th Street side? 14 15 MR. SHERMAN: It's split pretty evenly. It's split about 13 and -- 14 and 14 on both 16 17 sides, basically, which adds to 28. That's the 18 reason we are physically limited to no more than 19 28,000 feet. We just don't have anymore footage 20 for that. 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So if we 2.2 did pick a minimum number as opposed to 10,000, if 23 you said 24th Street, you can make that work. 24 Would you be willing to commit to a minimum of

14,000?

1	MR. BARANES: 13,300.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Or 13,300, to be
3	more precise.
4	MR. SHERMAN: Yes, with the
5	understanding Well, let me tell you why I came
6	back and said 10.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Make sure
8	you are talking into a microphone.
9	MR. SHERMAN: Here's the challenge
LO	right here. Okay? This is deep space. Okay? By
11	the time you get that deep, you are limited to the
L 2	number of people that are interested in it.
L 3	So if I can't get the right kind of
L 4	tenant in there, then what's going to happen is,
L 5	you know, they will cut off right there, and they
L 6	will say I don't want that space. What will
L 7	probably happen is it will end up as storage space.
L 8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Then what
L9	would you foresee doing with the space on the 15th
20	Street side, if you can't work out a deal with a
21	grocery store?
22	MR. SHERMAN: Well, we'll try very
23	hard. But if for some reason we cannot get there,
24	then I will probably then go to not a full service
25	grocery store but some kind of a food serving

_	operation that is more rotal in orientation.
2	There, the problem is they range in size from three
3	to four to 5,000 feet. They don't get that big.
4	But I'll try that for a while and see if I can't
5	get somebody in there.
6	If for some reason that completely
7	fails, then I would be obligated to go back to the
8	community and say I failed, and I'd have to pay
9	them a little bit more money, and then we would
LO	have to use the space for some other use.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I hope you
L 2	are as tenacious as you sound.
L 3	MR. SHERMAN: We're trying to be.
L 4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's great,
L 5	because I would love to shop there myself. All
L G	right.
L 7	Let me ask if, Mrs. Miller, do you have
L8	any questions, cross-examination questions? Would
L 9	you turn on the microphone for me?
20	MS. MILLER: No, I don't have any
21	questions.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It went off again.
23	MS. MILLER: I don't have any
24	questions, because we have heard them give it, and
25	we saw them before the Historic Preservation Review

_	board and the others. So we are precty wern
2	informed.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
4	Mrs. Glineur, did you have any cross-examination
5	questions? You need to come forward and get on a
6	microphone. Please just introduce yourself for the
7	record when you speak the first time.
8	MS. GLINEUR: Yes, Nicole Glineur.
9	MS. SPERLING: And Aliza Sperling.
LO	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We are only going
L1	to have one person representing the party, and you
L 2	don't need to use the handheld, if you are sitting
L 3	at the table.
L 4	MS. GLINEUR: Well, thank you very much
L 5	for this opportunity. First of all, we would like
L6	to qualify that the flexibility of the system did
L 7	not allow us that we are just looking for
L 8	consultation and compensation.
L9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, let me just
20	tell you how this procedure works.
21	MS. GLINEUR: Sure.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: At this juncture,
23	because you are a party, you are given the
24	opportunity to ask questions of the Applicant's
25	witnesses. So it's strictly about questions at

	chis point.
2	MS. GLINEUR: All right. What is the
3	height of the building on the 25th Street side?
4	MR. BARANES: Our measuring point is on
5	the east side, and there we are 90 feet. But
6	because there's a grade change to the other side,
7	measure on that side, it's 95 feet off the curb,
8	but less off the berm, obviously.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, 95 feet off
10	the curb.
11	MS. GLINEUR: Does that correspond to
12	10 floors, more or less?
13	MR. BARANES: Yes.
14	MS. GLINEUR: Have you consulted with
15	the neighboring development which is going to take
16	place about the same time, which is also going to
17	have a lot of parking lots as well as retail and
18	residential areas?
19	MR. BARANES: We have, but I believe I
20	should let Mr. Sherman answer that.
21	MR. SHERMAN: We have. That is being
22	developed by the JBG Companies, and we actually
23	have a shared reciprocal easement agreement between
24	parties, and we've spent a lot of time together,
25	and we are coordinating construction right now,

Т	even as we speak.
2	MS. GLINEUR: The question is asked,
3	because the traffic study and the other studies
4	which have been done have been done strictly
5	related to that particular building, and we are
6	looking
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let me have Mr.
8	Wells come forward, because I believe his testimony
9	was that he took into consideration new projects
10	that are planned or underway. So could you just
11	clarify that for the record?
12	MR. WELLS: We did take into explicit
13	account the new residential buildings that would be
14	built north of here. We were requested to do that
15	by DDOT. In fact, we did that.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
17	MS. GLINEUR: Thank you. There are a
18	few more questions that my colleague will ask.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: As I said earlier,
20	I just want one person representing the party. So
21	if you could just be that person, it's more
22	efficient for the Commission.
23	MS. GLINEUR: Well, sorry. We've all
24	been traveling, and we haven't had a chance to
25	consult. Could I ask an exception, and could she

1	just present these questions?
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: At this point,
3	it's probably quicker. So let's do that.
4	MS. SPERLING: Thank you. Has there
5	been a study on how much light will be blocked off
6	from the 25th Street residents?
7	MR. BARANES: We've not done any shadow
8	studies.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair,
LO	excuse me. Maybe this is inappropriate, but 1
L1	would like to know where they are first.
L2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's good.
L 3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And why they
L 4	are asking questions. Then I can have a better
L 5	understanding.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can you put up the
L 7	model drawing again? That would be fine, too. Ms.
L 8	Sperling, could you show us where your building is
L9	located? Just point to it. Mr. Baranes, your mike
20	is not on or else you are not holding it close
21	enough.
22	MR. BARANES; Is this better?
23	MS. SPERLING: We are located right
24	here.
25	MR BARANES: Okav

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So what we
are looking at is the property on the west side of
25th Street that's just south of where the alley
would cut across the private alley would cut
across, if we were drawing a straight line. Okay.
VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.
MS. SPERLING: My next question is if
parking will be free for customers of the
supermarket and the other commercial space?
MR. SHERMAN: The answer is yes, but
only for a certain period of time, and that is to
prevent them from parking there and then staying
there permanently. So if they haven't been out in
it will be about an hour, hour and a half. If
they shop there and they still haven't removed
their car, then there will be a charge.
MS. SPERLING: How many spaces will be
permitted?
MR. SHERMAN: Well, right now, as I
said earlier, we've offered them 30 spaces. They
have asked for 60, and we will probably end up with
some number in between. I would anticipate, at the
end of the day we will probably come in around 40
spaces.

MS. SPERLING:

Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Ι think we are ready to move to the report by the 2 Office of Planning now. 3 Madam Chair, members of 4 MR. JACKSON: 5 the Commission, my name is Arthur Jackson from the Office of Planning, and I am going to briefly go 6 7 through our report. Basically, we are standing on 8 9 record, but I will highlight the principal issues 10 that we think are covered by the Applicant's 11 presentation and their application. 12 Briefly, we endorse the project in that 13 it addresses a number of the needs the community has expressed, particularly with regard to home 14 15 ownership opportunities and the provision of ground floor retail. 16 17 note that, with respect to 18 evaluation standards under Section 2403 of 19 Zoning regulations, we think they meet all of those 20 standards such that it does provide -- The relative 21 value of the project amenities and benefits offered 2.2 is greater than the actual incentives that are 23 requested, which essentially is the ground floor --24 ability to provide ground floor commercial uses.

that

there

Wе

note

25

comments

are

received from the -- well, discussed with the Department of Transportation. We talked to Department of Police and Fire. The police did send back a response, but I think the response -- In the response, they were unaware of the fact that the Applicant will provide at least one space per resident, and was provided retail parking. So they just wanted to make sure that there was some parking provided on-site.

We note that they worked very diligently with the HPRB -- sorry, the Historic Preservation Review Board -- in addressing their concerns and issues, and even at this point are still working with them to develop this project to be as supportive as it can possibly be to the existing historic building and its surroundings.

Based on all this cooperation and the advance of the project, we recommend the conditional approval based on the Applicant providing at least 150 to 200 residential units, off-street parking equal to 285 spaces or at least one parking space per residential dwelling unit, that designating at least 28,000 square feet of around floor commercial space, that the ground floor commercial uses be limited to those uses

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

identified in Sections 701 and 721 of the Zoning regulations as neighborhood serving commercial, and that the Applicant participate in the DOES first source employment program, and that a signed agreement be added to the file.

We have noted the Applicant's interest getting some relief for some of these I would indicate that the reason requirements. that the Office of Planning was requesting that the signed agreement be added to the public record is only because, if there is a specific time by which the Applicant has to provide the document, then we know it will be in the file. In the past, I think there have been occasions where, when the document may not have been provided but there was no point at which to catch that missing item. So that's why we asked for that last provision.

As to the 28,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space, as you know, in our previous discussions about the HDRR overlay one of the reasons that we developed this proposal was because we wanted to develop a critical mass of available retail space within the area.

Under HDRR, if this tool is available, a new project on the site would have to provide .5

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

FAR of ground floor retail. At this point, this application is providing .28 FAR, which is less than what would be required before.

Now if they reduce that further, it is acceptable given the correct circumstances. However, we would like to see the provision as much available ground floor retail space be provided in order that in the future, assuming that at the time when we consider development of the adjacent property on Square 25, that the developer of that property would, hopefully, achieve that critical mass. That would allow us to provide the level and degree of retail space in the area that the community needs and demands.

So with that, those comments, we would encourage the Commission to require -- if they should decide to allow for reduction, to require a minimum amount be provided, whatever range you feel is appropriate.

In conclusion, we again support this project. We think that the proposal as presented offers a lot that the community can take advantage of, and that will aid the long term planning objectives of the area. We look forward to them breaking ground sometime in the near future.

2.2

That concludes the Office of Planning report, and we are available to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Jackson. I appreciate you reminding us of what we were trying to achieve with the HDRR overlay or what we continue to try to achieve. This is really, I think, a special case, because they don't even have .5 FAR -- The whole first floor probably barely occupies .5 FAR. So this is a challenge, and I think they are doing their best to meet that challenge.

Applicant There was the --The requesting flexibility to build as many as residential units, providing, of course, that there is one parking space per unit minimum, and also for flexibility regarding the changes in the design that they may need to work through with the HPRB and so forth. So what is the position of the Office οf Planning on those requests for flexibility?

MR. JACKSON: Well, obviously, we think that, because they have -- Our Historic Preservation Review Board and staff has worked so successfully with them in the past. I don't see that changing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	With regard to the numbers of
2	residential home ownership opportunities, again I
3	think between the addition of additional retail
4	opportunities in the area and home ownership
5	opportunities, I think the ANC and the Office of
6	Planning would really want to encourage as many
7	home ownership opportunities as possible.
8	Particularly if they are able to provide the
9	additional housing, provide some retail and have
10	more at least one parking space per unit, I
11	think this is nothing but a benefit for the
12	community.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right, thank
14	you. Any questions from the rest of the
15	Commission?
16	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD; Yes, Madam
17	Chair, I want to ask Mr. Jackson if he could repeat
18	what he said about the Department or DOES
19	agreement. I didn't follow that.
20	MR. JACKSON: Well, okay. Well, if you
21	look at our report, what we were asking is that the
22	DOES agreement be added to the file prior to the
23	public record prior to the proposed action.
24	Now, of course, the thought would be
25	that, if the Commission set a date for the proposed

1	action, then when the action was taken, the DOES
2	agreement would be in the file such that it would
3	not be a case of having someone in the Office of
4	Zoning having to make sure that the item is in
5	there before it goes over, or make sure that if the
6	item comes in, it's placed in the file before it
7	goes over.
8	So it's just having a date certain when
9	it would be available.
10	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So you
11	are saying, before we do a proposed action, we want
12	a signed agreement?
13	MR. JACKSON: Well, that's the
14	recommendation. Of course, if the Commission would
15	decide to make action tonight, I'm sure we could
16	depend on the representatives of the Applicant to
17	make sure that document got into the file at the
18	appropriate time.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, I guess
20	my question was, catching the last end of it, I
21	thought the only reason we were even doing it was
22	to put it in the file. I wanted to make sure it
23	has some teeth in it.
24	I'll go back to my statement that I
25	made earlier to the Applicant. So that was just a

Т	misunderstanding on my part. Inank you, Mr.
2	Jackson.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mrs. Miller, did
4	you have any questions?
5	MS. MILLER: I have no questions.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thank you.
7	Ms. Glineur, did you have any questions for the
8	Office of Planning?
9	MS. GLINEUR: No questions.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. I
11	would note, as Mr. Jackson mentioned then, in terms
12	of reports from other government agencies, that we
13	do have a report from the Second Police District,
14	Metropolitan Police, and Mr. Jackson mentioned what
15	he thought was a misunderstanding that triggered
16	their letter.
17	Am I correct that we do not have a
18	report from DDOT?
19	MR. JACKSON: No, Madam Chairman. I
20	contacted the Department of Transportation and
21	asked whether they had a copy of the report, and
22	asked if they could get any comments to me. But my
23	understanding is that they did review it, and what
24	normally is the case, particularly with PUDs, is
25	that, if there were serious concerns, that we would

Τ	have been notified. And we haven't heard anything.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Are there
3	any other reports by any other government agencies
4	of which you are aware?
5	MR. JACKSON: No, Madam Chairman, but I
6	believe there is one coming from the Department of
7	Housing and Community Development that is in favor
8	of this application.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is anyone here
LO	tonight representing Department of Housing and
l 1	Community Development or any other government
L 2	agency? MR. JACKSON: I was promised.
L3	It hasn't arrived yet, but I'm sure it's coming.
L 4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
L 5	
L 6	I think we are ready for the report by
L 7	the ANC now.
L 8	MS. MILLER: I am Dorothy Miller, Chair
L 9	of the ANC-2A, and we took a vote to ask Richard
20	Price, whose single member District it is, and he
21	knew that he might not be able to be here. So we
22	have also asked that Elizabeth Elliott give his
23	report our report, if you don't mind.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.
25	thought I saw him earlier. I guess he went away.

Okay. Would you turn the mike on?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

MS. ELLIOTT: Good evening, Chairperson Mitten and Commissioners Hood and May. I am not I am Elizabeth Elliott, and I am Richard Price. the immediate past Chair of the Advisory Neighborhood Commission 2A, and I am here this evening to present and to represent for the ANC the views of our ANC regarding our wholehearted support of the proposed redevelopment and adaptive reuse of the now historically landmark, Columbia Hospital for Women, site.

Working together and with the administration of the Columbia Hospital for Women in the kinder, gentler era of 1987, our then-elected Advisory Neighborhood Commission and our citizens group, the Foggy Bottom Association, had the foresight to protect our community by creating a passive but potentially very valuable asset.

The ANC, along with the FBA, entered into an agreement and covenant with the Columbia Hospital that runs with the land and limited the development of the site to considerably less than matter of right development.

Many of the community members,
Commissioner Price included, and leaders involved

with that agreement were, and are, long term residents of Foggy Bottom-West End and are still active in our community matters. So it does show the commitment that our residents have toward our Foggy Bottom neighborhood.

Sixteen years later in the spring of 2002, the Columbia Hospital for Women ceased to operate as a hospital. In August of 2002, the Board of Directors of the Foggy Bottom Association, our 50-year-old nonprofit citizens association whose membership represents nearly 500 households throughout Foggy Bottom-West End, immediately began working with the new property owner, High Street Columbia Limited Liability Corporation, a wholly owned subsidiary of Trammell Crow, to ensure the maximum value of our asset for the entirety of the Foggy Bottom-West End community.

The immediate goal was to convert our asset into a permanent vehicle for the continued protection and enhancement of our residential neighborhood, as well as to seek superior benefits for the city as a whole. We believe these important goals have been achieved in this presentation tonight by Trammell Crow.

In a very public process over a period

2.2

of many months with the review of and the unanimous support from the ANC and the community as a whole, the Foggy Bottom Association, led by its President and Board of Directors, negotiated an agreement that we believe will create a turning point for Foggy Bottom-West End.

Trammell Crow's application for a PUD project to redevelop the Columbia Hospital for Women represents the end product of this long and diligent effort between the Trammell Crow Company and the community to find a solution for development of a pivotal block in our neighborhood.

After many false starts, including the 1970's failed plan for the West End, which you have heard Commissioner Price comment about in a number of appearances here before the Commission, after years of what we perceive as anti-resident overdevelopment by our numerous nonprofit neighbors, not to be mentioned here tonight, we believe the Columbia Hospital for Women signifies in the revitalization of first step permanent, taxpaying residential community here in Foggy Bottom-West End.

In recent years, this Commission has strongly urged neighborhood groups to attempt to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

work with private developers to find solutions that avoid the need for contentious litigated zoning cases; and as the Commission knows, there have been a number of lengthy and hard fought zoning cases in the Foggy Bottom-West End area over the past decade.

While we originally thought that this project offered an opportunity to avoid a contested case proceeding through a straight rezoning, we now agree with the Office of Planning's and the Zoning Commission's approach to maintain the underlying residential zoning through implementing the PUD solution for this project, and we thank both OP and the Commission for your insight in this and your direction in that matter in support of this project as a PUD.

To recap, this application achieves a number of important goals of the comprehensive plan, including the designation of the hospital building and its site as an historic landmark, providing us with another resource community, historically; the provision οf additional housing in a neighborhood that has lost tremendous amounts of permanent resident housing in the provision of recent years; much

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

neighborhood-serving retail -- we are desperate for a grocery store down here, and we hope this is going to be finally -- at long last it is going to appear in the neighborhood; the stabilization and revitalization of Foggy Bottom-West End as a permanent residential neighborhood.

For us in Foggy Bottom-West End, project achieves two other important goals. preserves and actually expands the green space on the site, and you have heard form the Applicant they are going to expand what tonight how site, alreadv on the and we have gotten commitment from them that they will continue to work with us about this green space. It is very, very important to us, as our neighborhood gets even more developed.

Through its design, it assures that we will -- and this is a direct quote from Commissioner Price -- and through its design, it assures that we will not have one more 90-foot box stretching from property line to property line in the West End.

One thing that I did want to mention. We talked about this when I was still Chair of the ANC, and the current ANC continued this discussion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

about that area. There is a very special ambience 1 on the southern portion of that site. It is almost 2 like a little town. 3 4 I don't know how it's happened, because 5 you have that huge intersection with all traffic at Pennsylvania and L. But for about a 6 7 three block area, it is actually very quiet, and it is kind of a nice residential street with lots of 8 9 trees and a very pleasant experience over there. 10 One thing we do not want is to have M Street recreated on that stretch. So one of the 11 reasons we like the location of the retail is that 12 13 we don't have some sort of a strip along L Street, and we've had a lot of discussions about that. 14 15 I wanted to get that on the record tonight. 16 you for considering Wе thank 17 Applicant's presentation, and urge you to approve 18 this PUD. If you have any questions, I'd be happy 19 to answer them. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, 21 Any questions? Mr. Glasgow? I'm sorry, 2.2 I forgot to ask you if you had any questions for 23 Mr. Jackson, too. 24 MR. GLASGOW: No, no questions for Ms.

Elliott.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sorry. Ms.
2	Glineur, any questions for the ANC representative?
3	You need to come forward and get on a microphone.
4	MS. GLINEUR: Thank you. One question,
5	please. How would you see that the M Street
6	symptom is not replicated on the 25th Street with
7	the proposed height?
8	MS. ELLIOTT: I'm not sure what M
9	Street symptom you are talking about.
10	MS. GLINEUR: Perhaps I misunderstood,
11	but I thought that you mentioned that the M Street
12	symptom should not be replicated to this
13	development.
14	MS. ELLIOTT: I'd like to expand a
15	little bit on my comment. What I was speaking of
16	is M Street in Georgetown, not so much Well, so
17	much M Street on the other side, not because of the
18	height because of the amount of traffic that is
19	on that avenue.
20	MS. GLINEUR: Thank you.
21	MS. ELLIOTT: I'd like to make one more
22	comment that I forgot to mention in here.
23	Commissioner Price did meet with the 2501
24	Condominium Association, which is directly across
25	the street from the It's on 25th Street. They

1 are in support. They were in support of the 2 project. 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. 4 All right, on my list of witnesses I have Barbara 5 Spillinger, representing the Foggy Bottom Association as an organization in support. 6 Ιs 7 there anyone else who would like to testify this 8 evening in support? Okay. Then we will have Ms. 9 Spillinger. 10 SPILLINGER: Good evening, Madam MS. 11 Chair, Commissioner Hood, Commissioner May. 12 name is Barbara Spillinger, and I am here this 13 evening to represent as Vice President of the Foggy Association, 14 Bottom a citizen organization 15 representing local residents of Foggy Bottom-West End portion of the city in which the subject 16 17 property is located. 18 I wish to confirm, as stated in our 19 letter of May 15 to the Zoning Commission, that the 20 Bottom Association strongly and 21 enthusiastically supports the proposed application 2.2 for a Planned Unit Development and zoning 23 amendment for the former Columbia Hospital for 24 Women.

the developer have

FBA

and

25

worked

together from the beginning on this project, and we have found the developer especially sensitive to community priorities, such as the desperate need for community-friendly retail, further increments in the number of permanent, taxpaying residents in the Foggy Bottom area -- in fact, parenthetically, the developer has stated its goal of an 80 percent owner-occupied building -- and the restoration and preservation of the original 1915-1916 hospital building.

As Professor Sol Shalit, a resident of Foggy Bottom and a member of the FBA Board, so succinctly said in his December 18, 2002, letter to the Historic Preservation Review Board in support of this project, the new development would bring into our community quality residential, retail, housing and retail, both in dire need, and would spark its revitalization.

At the same time, I would like to thank the Office of Planning and, in particular, Ellen McCarthy who has met with the community several times, for the careful examination and thorough analysis given this project, and for the excellent report submitted by OP for your review.

This project not only is consistent

2.2

1	with the principles and objectives of the
2	comprehensive plan which declares as its first
3	precept the importance of stability for residential
4	neighborhoods, it is in keeping with the pronounced
5	objective of the Mayor to increase the permanent
6	residential base of the District by 100,000
7	persons.
8	FBA heartily endorses this project, and
9	encourages the Commission to do the same. Thank
10	you.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Ms.
12	Spillinger. Any questions? Mr. Glasgow? Mrs.
13	Miller? You could just shake your head. Okay.
14	Ms. Glineur? Okay, thank you very much.
15	All right. Now we are ready to take
16	the party in opposition. We are ready for you, Ms.
17	Glineur, to present your case, and you will have 15
18	minutes.
19	MS. GLINEUR: Thank you very much, Ms.
20	Chairman and gentlemen.
21	First, on behalf of the Condo
22	Association, we would like to qualify that we are
23	not against the development. We just would like to
24	look at consultation and compensation.
25	We are a little appalled that none of

the neighbors were consulted, and we do thank the Zoning Commission for having written directly to us, despite a bit late in the game.

We would like, basically, to talk about the environment -- social and environmental impacts in the development perspective. We are welcoming as neighbors the retail stores. I think all the community is looking for that.

What we are concerned is the loss of character of the 25th Street block between Pennsylvania and M, especially due to the height of the proposed buildings on the side of the street, the two buildings which have obtained change in the zoning regulations. We are clearly against the height and the loss of character that it entails, as well as the loss of light, the loss of view.

The loss of property value is an issue as well. We are seeing a move away from residents, which is why we would like to work with the developers and the architects and the commissions to help revert this move, because we do believe that a sound development, the way it is planned, can reverse that tendency.

We have seen more students and parents of students buying apartments in our block and the

2.2

neighboring blocks, and a lot of movement. We would like to see more professionals, and we would like to see more families. We also would like to see more trees and more green spaces.

We are also concerned in the increase of traffic in the already congested block. We would like to know when the deliveries would be made and when the trash withdrawals would take place.

By the way, all the parking on both sides of 25th Street are residential. There are no meters at this stage. We are also concerned in the decrease of the availability of the parking on that street, and overall we are concerned about a potential loss in quality of life.

Also, as referred to point number 5, currently we have noise that is being taking place due to the construction that has started of the parking lot, and it has been late at night and early in the morning. So, again, we would like to be consulted and be aware of the quiet neighborhood that this block was and of the fact that more and more people seeing these developments are not willing to stay.

On the impacts during construction, we

2.2

would like to mention the noise from construction, 1 also from moving and idling trucks. You might be 2 aware that each time a truck comes in, goes out, 3 4 idles, you have this constant beep. Neighbors have 5 already been complaining. Landscape disturbance: Currently, 6 you 7 have two big parking banners which are not in the 8 spirit of this block that the people adhered to, 9 again back to the character of the block. 10 also spurred Tt. has on weekends 11 recurrently idling of commercial buses from outside 12 Repeatedly, we have had to go and ask them not to park there, indicating to them that it is 13 14 not a parking. 15 third disturbance is ongoing and 16 future construction due to heavy truck traffic --17 congestion, sorry, due to heavy truck traffic. 18 Then the fourth concern is air pollution due to the 19 heavy movement of dust. 20 These are basically our concerns. We 21 do not want to take more of your time. We do -- We 2.2 would like to prevail the character of the block, and we do think it's possible in consultation with 23

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

We would like to see more consultation

all the partners involved.

24

1	in the future for any type of development. We
2	would like to help these type developments very
3	strongly, and we would like to see also the
4	environmental and social impacts being considered
5	and compensated for. Thank you, Ms. Chairman.
6	Thank you, gentlemen.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Let me
8	ask, are you aware of the existence of the Advisory
9	Neighborhood Commission and the Foggy Bottom
LO	Association and the West End Citizens Association?
l 1	MS. GLINEUR: We are We got together
L 2	as a block on 25th Street and wrote to the Zoning
L3	Commission when the first building was announced,
L 4	and nobody had been consulted, and we never heard
15	from them.
L 6	We never contacted the Foggy Bottom
L 7	Association, because we were under the impression
L 8	that it was only looking at the Foggy Bottom side.
L 9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: How about the ANC?
20	MS. GLINEUR: The ANC, we were not
21	aware of.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, so you are
23	not aware of the existence of the ANC?
24	MS. GLINEUR: As of tonight, no.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Because

1 some of the issues that you are raising are not really zoning issues, but I would encourage you to 2 get in touch with the ANC. Mrs. Miller is here, 3 and Ms. Elliott who is no longer a member of the 5 ANC but she is very involved. Mr. Price, I believe, represents your area, and he can work with 6 7 you on some of the issues that you have raised. 8 So some of these, they are not zoning 9 issues, and they can't be addressed in this forum. 10 So I just wanted to let you know that that is --11 they work very closely with some of the agencies to 12 resolve some of the issues you have raised about 13 idling buses and construction outside of the normal hours and so forth. 14 15 Thank you very much, Ms. MS. GLINEUR: 16 Chairman. A question: What is the avenue for working directly with the developers? 17 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, at this 19 point you can give us your comments. I mean, the 20 developers typically approach the ANC, because the 21 ANC is -- they represent -- they are the elected 2.2 representatives for the community. So that's where the heavy lifting goes on. 23 24 MS. GLINEUR: As citizens, what are the

rights of the condo associations?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I don't want to -- It's really not appropriate for you to sit and ask me questions, and I'm trying to be a little bit helpful, because you are, obviously, not familiar with the process. But basically to contact the developer, if you want to have an individual voice, you have to contact the developer and not wait.

This is very late in the game when something gets to the Commission, if you want to be involved in design changes, particularly since the project has garnered the support of several important groups, and the ANC is among the most important, that they get their support, and they have the support of the ANC.

MS. GLINEUR: is That clearly understood, but we have seen in similar developments elsewhere consultation directly with the parties affected, as manifested by the letters we each received, each condo received within the Association. We thank you for that, and this is in response to that concern and also to us being directly addressed, and we are here.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand. And I don't mean to suggest that your concerns are not

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

going to be taken into consideration, even at this 1 point. But in terms of trying to participate in 2 design changes, that needs to be done early on, if 3 4 you want to participate in that way. 5 Let me see if any other Commissioners have questions. Any questions? 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, I 8 just had one or two. You mentioned the height. 9 Obviously, from your testimony I believe that there 10 is some other development going on around the area 11 which you are having some existing problems with. 12 There may have been a matter of right project that would not have come before this Commission or any 13 board, which would have just -- they had the right, 14 15 because of the zoning, to go ahead and proceed with 16 construction. 17 there something else going on 18 that area? 19 MS. GLINEUR: As far as I'm aware, the 20 the other side was limited to four height on 21 stories up to recently. 2.2 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okav. МУ 23 reasoning for asking you is because you said you 24 weren't notified. Unfortunately, things that are a 25 matter of right we don't get notified. I have the

1	same issues over in my area. They just show up.
2	You don't get notified. But I have to say I'll
3	go back to my previous statement. ANC-2A has been
4	one of the hardest working ANCs that I A lot of
5	ANCs don't show up for projects, but I don't
6	believe I've been here in five years that that ANC
7	has not been down here in front of us.
8	I'm sure, now that you've been brought
9	up to speed on that ANC that, hopefully, you can
10	get on board with them, and you all can work
11	together, because I'm sure they have an open ear;
12	because they have been here on every case within
13	their ANC. I haven't seen them miss one yet.
14	So that's something that may be able to
15	help you with that issue.
16	Again, your condo association You
17	are representing the whole condo?
18	MS. GLINEUR: Yes.
19	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Actually, you
20	are a little bit behind Where the proposed
21	private alley you are actually a little bit
22	behind that. Right?
23	MS. GLINEUR: We are right opposite to
24	it, perhaps leaning a little bit to the right.
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So there's only

really a portion of your complex that --1 2 MS. GLINEUR: Architectural measurement would have to be taken to answer that question 3 4 precisely. I mean, we were a little bit amazed 5 also at the lack of precision on the other side. I mean, we cannot be precise either. 6 7 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm not asking 8 you to be precise. I'm just trying to understand. 9 I don't get over there much because of traffic 10 issues, but I can tell you that -- and I've said 11 that before. But I can assure you that I'm just 12 trying to get a kind of a feel of exactly how you -- You stated some issues here, some of which are in 13 Some of them are not. 14 our purview. But you 15 mentioned light and air. So I'm trying to get a reference, even 16 17 though it was pointed to me, a reference of exactly 18 how much your view may be being obscured, if it's 19 being obscured. 20 view will MS. GLINEUR: The be obscured, because for the moment there is nothing 21 2.2 except the remote part of the -- Perhaps it can be 23 shown on the map -- of the Columbia Hospital that

is obstructing slightly the view, and it's not

really an obstruction. But there will be direct

24

_	Obstitution of fight with the foreseen
2	construction.
3	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just
4	What remedy are you proposing?
5	MS. GLINEUR: We realize we are
6	stepping in late in the game, and at the risk of
7	being repetitive, perhaps for the future residents
8	should be consulted earlier. But we would like to
9	explore options with the developers. And again, we
LO	are absolutely not against development. We are pro
11	development, especially this type of development,
L 2	which is done in a wonderful manner, and also to
L 3	the retail that it is going to bring to the
L 4	neighborhood.
L 5	We are concerned, as you are, about
L 6	traffic. We do think there are avenues to explore
L 7	to relieve the traffic. So again, it's a
L 8	consultation mode that we are looking for.
L9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: No further
20	questions, Madam Chair.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Glasgow, any
22	questions?
23	MR. GLASGOW: I don't have any
24	questions.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Thank

	you. Mis. Miller:
2	MS. MILLER: I'd like to know how she
3	could have missed. We post 100 signs. So I would
4	like to know how you could have missed not knowing
5	about the ANC, not knowing that the ANC has taken
6	this up twice, plus the building across the street
7	from you, plus the other building, plus the other
8	two that are going up, and you had every
9	opportunity to see the plans and ask questions.
10	We will be happy, if you are not on the
11	mailing list, to put you on the mailing list.
12	MS. GLINEUR: Well, thank you very much
13	for this opportunity. We will look forward to it.
14	We are probably very nearsighted, but we didn't
15	see any postings or anything, and we are sorry we
16	missed. We are not here to, again, oppose. We are
17	here to consult and consolidate.
18	MS. MILLER: Well, see, that's what we
19	did in our meetings. That's the reason why I'm
20	asking and
21	MS. GLINEUR: Sure. We appreciate what
22	you did, and apparently you've been doing a great
23	job, and it is much appreciated.
24	MS. MILLER: And so has Richard. He

posts 15 signs in your neighborhood.

1	MS. GLINEUR: We haven't seen any signs
2	in the streets.
3	MS. MILLER: Oh, we don't put them on
4	the streets.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mrs. Miller, we
6	are going to ask you to continue this dialogue.
7	MS. MILLER: I just want to tell her
8	one more thing.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right.
10	MS. MILLER: If she will look at the
11	sign for the meeting next Wednesday, we are taking
12	up the Mayor's desire to have all of the tour buses
13	in the world come to Washington. She complained
14	about that. They are setting up a website.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: listen to her
16	in that.
17	MS. MILLER: Yes. If she will come to
18	the meeting, she dan hear about why the buses are
19	parking where they are parking, if she would like
20	to know. If you would like to know.
21	MS. GLINEUR: Thank you very much. One
22	thing that needs to be realized is that, you know,
23	the Foggy Bottom Association may have not been as
24	concerned with the West End part, and speaking with
25	all the neighbors; because I consulted on the first

1	building with a previous actually, a leader who
2	had given up, because they really hadn't been heard
3	and excuse me, I don't mean this to be
4	derogative neither by the Zoning Commission nor
5	the Foggy Bottom Association.
6	So it's just, you know, also a little
7	bit the homework done didn't sound too productive.
8	Thank you.
9	MS. MILLER: And I like to ask her why
10	she has not been able to pick up a copy or seen the
11	Foggy Bottom News, and they
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: This is getting a
13	little far afield of zoning issues now.
14	MS. MILLER: No, but the thing is, see,
15	all of this has been taken up. They have come
16	before both of us.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Great. You guys
18	can talk about this later. Okay?
19	MS. MILLER: Okay. I just wanted her
20	to know, she's missed a great opportunity.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
22	Thank you
23	MS. GLINEUR: Thank you very much.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Now I have a few
25	folks who have signed up to testify in opposition.

One is Harriet Hubbard, but I don't see Mrs. 1 Hubbard here. Then Mr. Trimm, Boris Trimm? Anyone 2 else who hasn't signed up that would like to 3 4 testify in opposition? All right. Mr. Glasgow? 5 MR. GLASGOW: Wе appreciate the Commission's taking the time 6 to hear us this 7 evening. I think we did through qo presentation relatively quickly, and we thought it 8 9 was very complete. 10 We do believe that we have met 11 burden of proof in this case for this Planned Unit 12 There are only a couple of minor Development. 13 things that I did want to touch base on. One was the condition suggested by the 14 15 Office of Planning. I think we've come to closure Up to 235 units; up 16 on all of those: 325 17 parking spaces with the one-to-one, 31 retail and 18 then the rest would be allocated 19 according to need; 10,000 square feet minimum for 20 the retail, up to 28,000 square feet. 21 With respect to the DOES agreement, I 2.2 think that what would be most beneficial there is if we can have that -- that that would need to be 23 24 in the record prior to the issuance of the order.

That would protect everybody, and it would allow us

to proceed forward to get a decision.

2.2

We have some real time constraints that we have had given. We started this process, I guess, either last August or September, and I know, when you get to the last hurdle, that you have to come. It just so happened that it was the Zoning Commission in this case, but there was a historic landmark designation that we dealt with, and we went through a lot of process, a lot of community meetings, and we would like to get a preliminary action by the Commission, if we could, this evening.

As I say, we do believe that we have met the burden of proof. One of the reasons why I'm asking this, because I know it is a little bit unusual when you do have a party in opposition in the case, is that we haven't asked for anything more than we could build from a height and bulk standpoint than the underlying zoning already permits.

If you took out the retail, we could put that building exactly where it is, to the exact height that it is, without having to come and go through a process. So that is underlying why it is that we would like to get this decision. Mr.

1	Sherman has some real time constraints that we have
2	with respect to this, and there was some risk, and
3	developers are risk takers, but we took a risk
4	that, if we worked with the community very, very
5	hard, and that if we worked with the Office of
6	Planning and the Historic Preservation Review
7	Board, that we could meet some time constraints
8	that we had.
9	When you look at it in the abstract, I
10	guess you could say, well, a year is not
11	unreasonable to think that, if you are working very
12	hard with everybody, that you ought to be able to
13	complete the process. With the Commission being
14	out in August, we have some time constraints that
15	come up on us in September, and we would like it if
16	the Commission could accommodate on that.
17	Thank you for your attention.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, Thank you.
19	
20	MR. JACKSON: Madam Chair, a question
21	of clarification. Now I was looking at During
22	Mr. Baranes' presentation, did you say the height
23	of the building is going to be 95 feet?
24	MR. BARANES: The zoning height of the

building is 90 feet. It increases by a few feet

1	because of the drop in grade at one corner of the
2	site.
3	MR. JACKSON: I was just wondering if
4	you needed to ask for additional relief under 2405,
5	the five percent. If you don't need that, I was
6	just thinking you might want to address that now.
7	MR. BARANES: We do not need that.
8	MR. JACKSON: Okay, thanks.
9	MR. BARANES: Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He was just
11	answering a specific question from the party in
12	opposition about the height relative to 25th Street
13	at that point.
14	Mr. May, did you
15	COMMISSIONER MAY: I was wondering if
16	you were willing to entertain a motion on this?
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let's do it.
18	COMMISSIONER MAY: Okay. Then, well,
19	subject to further discussion on conditions, I
20	guess, I would move approval of Case Number 03-11,
21	Consolidated Planned Unit Development and Map
22	Amendment from R-5-D to C-2-C at 2425 L Street,
23	N.W.
24	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right, we have

We have a motion and a second. a second. just repeat for the ultimate in clarity what Mr. Glasgow just ran down, which I believe -- and then I would either ask you or I will address concerns of the party in opposition, that as a part of the PUD that there will be flexibility to have to 235 residential units, up to 325 parking spaces provided that there is one parking space -a minimum of one parking space for each residential unit; that there be a minimum of 10,000 square feet of retail space, neighborhood serving retail space, consistent with the cited sections of Chapter 7; and up to 28,000 square feet of retail space; that there be flexibility for changes in the design to accommodate whatever final decisions are made by HPRB, as long as those changes are consistent with the R-5-D zone parameters; and that the signed DOES agreement will be made a part of the record prior to issuance of the final order in this case.

So those would be the conditions that I would, I guess, ask you to adopt as part of your motion.

COMMISSIONER MAY; Right. I was looking for exactly that reiteration. You have one that I had missed on my notes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

Т	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER MAY: So that is the
3	complete recounting.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I would
5	like to just take the opportunity to address the
6	concerns of the party in opposition. We are not
7	insensitive to the issues that you raised, but what
8	Mr. Glasgow said at the outset is very important to
9	us, which is this project could go forward in
10	basically the mass that it has without any action
11	on the part of the Commission.
12	It is really about accommodating the
13	introduction of neighborhood serving retail use
14	that they are even in front of us. So there could
15	be a 90-foot building built across from your
16	property as a matter of right, and there would be
17	no public process.
18	As a matter of fact, if I'm reading Mr.
19	Sher's zoning map correctly, your property is zoned
20	C-2-C as well and could be developed to a much
21	higher degree than it is now as well.
22	So I'm satisfied that in this case that
23	the concerns are not arising from the concerns
24	of the party in opposition are not arising from the
2.5	action that we will take as part of this DIE

relative to what could happen as a matter of right. 1 2 So I think that their concerns will be addressed, if not satisfied. Is there anything 3 4 else you would like to add? 5 COMMISSIONER MAY: I would want to underscore that point. I mean, we are in sort of 6 7 an unusual situation here in that we have 8 applicant asking permission to do something that we 9 very much want done, and are going to a lot of 10 extra trouble to do it for us. Well, wouldn't it 11 all be great if every case came this way? It really is exceptional, and we do 12 appreciate it. It's not done without consideration 13 of the concerns of the affected parties. We are 14 15 concerned and want to hear that and want to know what the issues are. But in truth, if we left this 16 17 to matter of right, the neighborhood would wind up 18 with a worse building, and so we are -- I think 19 this is a very positive thing for us to consider, 20 and it's a very good case. 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Ιf 2.2 there is no further discussion, then I would --23 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair. 24 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, I'm sorry. 25 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I would also just agree with both of my colleagues. While we don't take the opposition lightly, the consultation issues and the issues that were stated, I think, can be addressed in another forum. I don't think this would be the appropriate forum, and I think the initial response to the Applicant to some of the citizens' concerns about the retail, and our concerns also, I think, shows the Applicant has acted in good faith.

also need We to encourage 2.A to continue to work with applicants, because again this is precedent setting for me in my tenure here on the Commission, and I'm not making that as a I'm very serious. I think that this is joke. precedent setting. Maybe we can get this applicant to work with other applicants throughout the city, because it's good when you have a -- This is not the forum set up to fight projects. When it comes down to smooth sailing like this, it makes our jobs a lot easier.

So it's appreciated. While we don't take the opposition lightly, there are other forums in which some of those issues could be addressed. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. If

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	there is no further discussion, then I would ask
2	for all those in favor to please say Aye. Those
3	opposed, please say No. Ms. Schellin, would you
4	record the vote?
5	MS. SCHELLIN: Yes. Staff would record
6	the vote 3 to zero to 2, Commission May moving,
7	Commissioner Hood seconding, Commissioner Mitten in
8	favor, of approving for proposed action case Number
9	03-11, Commissioners Hannaham and Parsons not
10	present, not voting.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And I know that
12	staff would want me to just remember to invite you
13	to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions
14	of law, if you so choose.
15	MR. GLASGOW: We certainly so choose.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. I
17	would like to thank everybody for coming out
18	tonight, and for all the hard work that the ANC and
19	the Applicant and the Foggy Bottom Association have
20	put into this. It made our job easy tonight.
21	This hearing is now adjourned.
22	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went
23	off the record at 8:26 p.m.)
24	